DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 813 JC 030 700

TITLE	Access Lost: An Examination of Supply Constriction and Rationing in the California Community College System.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	2003-09-00
NOTE	21p.; Prepared by the Technology, Research, and Management Services Division.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; College Attendance; *Community Colleges; Declining Enrollment; *Economics of Education; Educational Demand; Educational Finance; Educational Supply; Enrollment; Enrollment Influences; Student Costs; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document examines the effects of budget cuts and supply restriction and rationing within the California Community College (CCC) system during the fiscal year (FY) 2002-03. Fiscal Crises within the California State Government in FY 2002-03 have resulted in a reduction in available funding for the CCC system; as a result the system's ability to provide an adequate supply of courses to meet the demand of educational consumers in the state is in question. Prior to any enacted fee increases to help ameliorate the problem, a downward trend of section offerings occurred. Because the fee increase did not contribute to this downward trend, the student headcount and course section offering losses that occurred were primarily attributable to a supply constriction in the system. This document discusses and provides tables for the following areas: (1) funding; (2) student headcount; (3) course sections; and (4) student demographics. Findings from the study include: (1) a significant drop in the number of first-time and returning students; (2) a significant drop in the number in special admit (K-12) students; (3) an increase in the number of continuing students; (4) a decrease in the percentage of first-time/returning students who attend classes in the evening; and (5) a decrease in the percentage of students who were older. (Contains 22 tables.) (Author/JS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 813

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Technology, Research, and Management Information Services Division

Access Lost:
An Examination of Supply Constriction and Rationing in the California Community College System

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Nusslaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

September, 2003

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
www.cccco.edu

JC030700

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Access Lost:
An Examination of Supply Constriction and Rationing in the California Community College System

Patrick C. Perry
Vice Chancellor of Technology, Research, and Information Systems
September 2003

Overview

This paper is an examination of the effects of budget cuts and supply restriction and rationing within the California Community College (CCC) system during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2002-03. The topics to be examined include changes in student enrollment, demographics, and course offerings.

Fiscal crises within California State government in FY 2002-03 have resulted in a reduction in available funding for the CCC system; as a result, the system's ability to provide an adequate supply of courses to meet the demand of educational consumers in the State is in question. While a $7 per unit fee increase is slated to occur beginning in Fall, 2003 (FY 2003-04), a downward trend of section offerings and student headcount occurred in FY 2002-03 (most notably in Spring, 2003) prior to any enacted fee increase. Because the fee increase did not contribute to this downward trend, the student headcount and course section offering losses that occurred in Spring 2003 were primarily attributable to a supply constriction in the system. Since only one economic factor is in play, it offers a unique opportunity to study this supply-reduction scenario without the added complexity of having to concurrently assess fee impacts.

Outline

- ***Funding***
  - Table 1: System Funding, 1992-93 to present

- ***Student Headcount***
  - Table 2: Student Headcount by Primary (Fall/Spring) Terms, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

- ***Course Sections***
  - Table 3: Sections Offered, Total Enrollments, and Average Class Size, Fall 1992-Spring 2003
  - Table 4: Course Sections Offered by Credit/Noncredit Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003
  - Table 5: Course Sections Offered by Transferable/Non-Transferable Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003
  - Table 6: Course Sections Offered by Vocational/Non-Vocational Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003
  - Table 7: Top Fifteen Curricular Areas Where FTES was Lost, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
  - Table 8: Top Fifteen Curricular Areas Where FTES was Gained, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
  - Table 9: Special Admit (K-12) Students in Physical Education Courses: Headcount and FTES, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

- ***Student Demographics***
  - Total Student Populations
    - Table 10: Distribution of Students by Gender, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 11: Distribution of Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 12: Distribution of Students by Age, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 13: Distribution of Students by Educational Goal, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 14: Distribution of Students by First Census Credit Load, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 15: Distribution of Students by Units Earned, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
    - Table 16: Student Headcount by Enrollment Status, Spring 2002-Spring 2003
      - Table 17: Total Headcount of First-Time and Returning Students for Spring Terms 1993-2003
      - Table 18: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Gender, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

- Table 19: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2000-Spring 2003
    - Table 20: Distribution of Continuing Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2000-Spring 2003
- Table 21: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Day/Evening Status, Spring 2000-Spring 2003
- Table 22: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Age, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

- ***Conclusions***

Funding

As shown in Table 1, the CCC system enjoyed a period of strong funding growth after the budget crises of the early 1990's; FY 2002-03 marked the first decline in system funding since FY 1993-94. Its timing was inopportune; the CCC system had been making strides toward reducing the participation gap standard of 73 students per 1,000 adults. Combined with rapid growth in demand caused by Tidal Wave II, this funding reduction not only hampered the systems' ability to serve the influx of new students, it affected the systems' ability to serve existing students in ways that are further examined in this paper.

Table 1: System Funding, 1992-93 to Present

Fiscal Year	System Funding (Billions)
1992-93	$2.738
1993-94	2.729
1994-95	2.757
1995-96	2.948
1996-97	3.199
1997-98	3.530
1998-99	3.889
1999-00	4.087
2000-01	4.672
2001-02	4.964
2002-03	4.878

Source: Chancellor's Office, Fiscal Services

Student Headcount

There have been three main periods of enrollment phenomenon during the last ten years. As shown in Table 2, beginning in Fall 1992, the system experienced a period of general enrollment decline through Spring 1995, directly coinciding with the flat funding patterns shown in Table 1 above for these years. After this, a long sustained period of expansion occurred: fifteen consecutive primary terms where each successive term had a higher student headcount than the previous term. Spring 2003 represented the end of the expansion, although Fall 2002 presented early signs that contraction was about to occur. The student headcount of the CCC system in Spring 2003 returned to that of the level of Fall 2001.

Table 2: Student Headcount by Primary (Fall/Spring) Terms, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Term	Headcount	Change
Fall 1992	1,500,360	
Spring 1993	1,412,227	-5.9%
Fall 1993	1,376,560	-2.5%
Spring 1994	1,379,524	0.2%
Fall 1994	1,358,484	-1.5%
Spring 1995	1,334,549	-1.8%
Fall 1995	1,336,695	0.2%
Spring 1996	1,387,251	3.8%
Fall 1996	1,408,780	1.6%
Spring 1997	1,438,172	2.1%
Fall 1997	1,452,102	1.0%
Spring 1998	1,471,127	1.3%
Fall 1998	1,494,849	1.6%
Spring 1999	1,520,296	1.7%
Fall 1999	1,547,960	1.8%
Spring 2000	1,570,917	1.5%
Fall 2000	1,585,271	0.9%
Spring 2001	1,637,052	3.3%
Fall 2001	1,686,916	3.0%
Spring 2002	1,741,352	3.2%
Fall 2002	1,744,143	0.2%
Spring 2003	1,690,454	-3.1%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Course Sections

The loss of student headcount in Spring 2003 comes as a result of a reduction of available course section offerings. Even though the system continued to accommodate as many students as possible by increasing class sizes (or implementing higher class size floors, as many institutions claim to have done), the ability to mitigate demand by increasing class size with fewer classes was an unsustainable measure. Table 3 shows the number of course sections offered in the CCC system, the associated total number of enrollments in these sections, and the average class size for system course offerings.

Table 3: Sections Offered, Total Enrollments, and Average Class Size, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Term	Sections Offered	Enrollments	Average Class Size
Fall 1992	140,322	3,954,125	28.18
Spring 1993	139,157	3,672,583	26.39
Fall 1993	134,425	3,677,270	27.36
Spring 1994	137,919	3,643,603	26.42
Fall 1994	134,292	3,645,158	27.14
Spring 1995	135,218	3,540,415	26.18
Fall 1995	135,234	3,600,897	26.63
Spring 1996	138,567	3,619,363	26.12
Fall 1996	141,507	3,764,473	26.60
Spring 1997	147,807	3,767,862	25.49
Fall 1997	148,446	3,914,969	26.37
Spring 1998	152,622	3,875,475	25.39
Fall 1998	151,427	3,993,565	26.37
Spring 1999	156,833	4,002,800	25.52
Fall 1999	157,015	4,184,120	26.65
Spring 2000	160,728	4,135,768	25.73
Fall 2000	160,697	4,270,776	26.58
Spring 2001	165,906	4,299,749	25.92
Fall 2001	166,735	4,564,156	27.37
Spring 2002	172,811	4,674,836	27.05
Fall 2002	170,373	4,867,043	28.57
Spring 2003	164,597	4,676,951	28.41

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Course Sections: Credit/Noncredit. Table 4 shows the history of course section offerings by credit/noncredit status. Beginning in Fall 2002, both credit sections and noncredit sections were reduced in roughly the same proportion for FY 2002-03. The number of credit sections offered began to decline in Fall 2002, and dropped sharply in Spring 2003; the reverse was true for noncredit sections, which experienced its most largest drop in Fall, 2002.

Table 4: Course Sections Offered by Credit/Noncredit Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Term	Credit Sections	Change	Pct.	Noncredit Sections	Change	Pct.
Fall 1992	129,737			10,585		
Spring 1993	128,205	-1,532	-1.2%	10,952	367	3.5%
Fall 1993	123,822	-4,383	-3.4%	10,603	-349	-3.2%
Spring 1994	126,767	2,945	2.4%	11,152	549	5.2%
Fall 1994	124,002	-2,765	-2.2%	10,290	-862	-7.7%
Spring 1995	124,283	281	0.2%	10,935	645	6.3%
Fall 1995	124,630	347	0.3%	10,604	-331	-3.0%
Spring 1996	127,509	2,879	2.3%	11,058	454	4.3%
Fall 1996	130,143	2,634	2.1%	11,364	306	2.8%
Spring 1997	135,977	5,834	4.5%	11,830	466	4.1%
Fall 1997	136,375	398	0.3%	12,071	241	2.0%
Spring 1998	140,051	3,676	2.7%	12,571	500	4.1%
Fall 1998	139,148	-903	-0.6%	12,279	-292	-2.3%
Spring 1999	144,117	4,969	3.6%	12,716	437	3.6%
Fall 1999	144,028	-89	-0.1%	12,987	271	2.1%
Spring 2000	147,559	3,531	2.5%	13,169	182	1.4%
Fall 2000	148,251	692	0.5%	12,446	-723	-5.5%
Spring 2001	153,021	4,770	3.2%	12,885	439	3.5%
Fall 2001	153,881	860	0.6%	12,854	-31	-0.2%
Spring 2002	158,809	4,928	3.2%	14,002	1,148	8.9%
Fall 2002	156,880	-1,929	-1.2%	13,493	-509	-3.6%
Spring 2003	151,227	-5,653	-3.6%	13,370	-123	-0.9%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Course Sections: Transferable/Non-Transferable. Table 5 shows the history of course section offerings by transferable/non-transferable status. Non-transferable sections took a disproportionately large percentage reduction as compared to transferable sections in both Fall 2002 and Spring 2003.

Table 5: Course Sections Offered by Transferable/Non-Transferable Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Term	Transferable Sections	Change	Pct.	Non-Transferable Sections	Change	Pct.
Fall 1992	93,989			46,333		
Spring 1993	92,875	-1,114	-1.2%	46,282	-51	-0.1%
Fall 1993	90,446	-2,429	-2.6%	43,979	-2,303	-5.0%
Spring 1994	92,926	2,480	2.7%	44,993	1,014	2.3%
Fall 1994	90,418	-2,508	-2.7%	43,874	-1,119	-2.5%
Spring 1995	90,242	-176	-0.2%	44,976	1,102	2.5%
Fall 1995	91,168	926	1.0%	44,066	-910	-2.0%
Spring 1996	93,471	2,303	2.5%	45,096	1,030	2.3%
Fall 1996	95,580	2,109	2.3%	45,927	831	1.8%
Spring 1997	100,351	4,771	5.0%	47,456	1,529	3.3%
Fall 1997	99,796	-555	-0.6%	48,650	1,194	2.5%
Spring 1998	102,465	2,669	2.7%	50,157	1,507	3.1%
Fall 1998	101,949	-516	-0.5%	49,478	-679	-1.4%
Spring 1999	105,613	3,664	3.6%	51,220	1,742	3.5%
Fall 1999	105,182	-431	-0.4%	51,833	613	1.2%
Spring 2000	107,948	2,766	2.6%	52,780	947	1.8%
Fall 2000	108,743	795	0.7%	51,954	-826	-1.6%
Spring 2001	112,242	3,499	3.2%	53,664	1,710	3.3%
Fall 2001	113,558	1,316	1.2%	53,177	-487	-0.9%
Spring 2002	117,260	3,702	3.3%	55,551	2,374	4.5%
Fall 2002	115,873	-1,387	-1.2%	54,500	-1,051	-1.9%
Spring 2003	112,731	-3,142	-2.7%	51,866	-2,634	-4.8%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Course Sections: Vocational/Non-Vocational. Table 6 shows the history of course section offerings by vocational/non-vocational status. Vocational sections have historically been offered more in Spring terms than in Fall terms; note the pattern below showing lower numbers of vocational course offerings in Fall terms followed by increases in Spring terms. Non-vocational course offerings do not follow the same pattern.

As shown below, vocational course section offerings took a disproportionately large cut in FY 2002-03; the system shed over 7.5% of its vocational course offerings.

Table 6: Course Sections Offered by Vocational/Non-Vocational Status, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Term	Voc. Ed Sections	Change	Pct.	Non-Voc. Ed Sections	Change	Pct
Fall 1992	46,884			93,438		
Spring 1993	46,956	72	0.2%	92,201	-1,237	-1.3%
Fall 1993	45,166	-1,790	-3.8%	89,259	-2,942	-3.2%
Spring 1994	47,101	1,935	4.3%	90,818	1,559	1.7%
Fall 1994	44,576	-2,525	-5.4%	89,716	-1,102	-1.2%
Spring 1995	45,866	1,290	2.9%	89,352	-364	-0.4%
Fall 1995	44,867	-999	-2.2%	90,367	1,015	1.1%
Spring 1996	46,881	2,014	4.5%	91,686	1,319	1.5%
Fall 1996	46,894	13	0.0%	94,613	2,927	3.2%
Spring 1997	50,084	3,190	6.8%	97,723	3,110	3.3%
Fall 1997	49,654	-430	-0.9%	98,792	1,069	1.1%
Spring 1998	53,023	3,369	6.8%	99,599	807	0.8%
Fall 1998	51,782	-1,241	-2.3%	99,645	46	0.0%
Spring 1999	54,975	3,193	6.2%	101,858	2,213	2.2%
Fall 1999	54,033	-942	-1.7%	102,982	1,124	1.1%
Spring 2000	56,834	2,801	5.2%	103,894	912	0.9%
Fall 2000	55,422	-1,412	-2.5%	105,275	1,381	1.3%
Spring 2001	58,988	3,566	6.4%	106,918	1,643	1.6%
Fall 2001	58,385	-603	-1.0%	108,350	1,432	1.3%
Spring 2002	62,678	4,293	7.4%	110,133	1,783	1.6%
Fall 2002	59,528	-3,150	-5.0%	110,845	712	0.6%
Spring 2003	57,973	-1,555	-2.6%	106,624	-4,221	-3.8%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES): Gains and Reductions in Curricular Areas. Tables 7 and 8 show the top fifteen curricular areas (as defined by TOP Code) where gains and losses occurred between Spring 2002 and Spring 2003.

Table 7: Top Fifteen Curricular Areas (of at least 1,000 FTES) where FTES was Lost, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Subject Area	Spring 2002 FTES	Spring 2003 FTES	FTES Loss
General Studies	53,359.00	48,997.20	-4,361.80
Computer & Information Science, General	14,183.80	10,998.90	-3,184.90
Physical Education	33,487.10	30,579.80	-2,907.30
Secretary/Administrative Assistant	9,853.40	7,686.90	-2,166.50
Administration of Justice	11,314.30	9,674.40	-1,639.90
Mathematics, General	43,535.10	42,208.90	-1,326.20
English	34,338.80	33,251.10	-1,087.70
Computer Programming	4,091.30	3,016.50	-1,074.80
Electronics & Electric Technology	3,495.80	2,503.30	-992.50
Music	12,874.30	12,283.10	-591.20
Data Processing - Operations	2,728.10	2,182.40	-545.70
Art	14,892.50	14,386.40	-506.10
Photography	1,869.10	1,489.30	-379.80
Business and Commerce, General	5,342.50	4,979.80	-362.70
Business Management	3,206.30	2,982.00	-224.30

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Table 8: Top Fifteen Curricular Areas (of at least 1,000 FTES) where FTES was Gained, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Subject Area	Spring 2002 FTES	Spring 2003 FTES	FTES Gain
Nursing, R.N.	10,394.20	11,704.90	1,310.70
Natural (Life) Science, General	17,372.30	18,034.50	662.20
Real Estate	1,889.40	2,409.00	519.60
Physiology (Includes Anatomy)	2,666.50	3,129.50	463.00
Chemistry, General	9,871.80	10,107.10	235.30
Fine Arts, General	2,251.20	2,481.90	230.70
Political Science	6,805.80	7,020.90	215.10
Sociology	6,342.40	6,543.80	201.40
Social Sciences, General	1,732.80	1,925.40	192.60
Accounting	7,217.20	7,390.20	173.00
Emergency Medical Technology	2,376.50	2,544.80	168.30
Health Education	4,577.30	4,744.90	167.60
Drafting Technology	2,122.10	2,258.80	136.70
Nutrition and Food	3,921.80	4,026.50	104.70
Anthropology	6,601.30	6,702.20	100.90

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

FTES and Headcount: Special Admit (K-12) Students in Physical Education Courses. Table 9 shows the decline in the number of and FTES generated by special admit (K-12) students taking physical education courses in the CCC system. This activity dropped 61.3% in FTES between Spring 2002 and Spring 2003.

Table 9: Special Admit (K-12) Students in Physical Education Courses: Headcount and FTES, Fall 1992-Spring 2003

Year	Summer		Fall		Winter		Spring		Annual Total	
	Students	FTES	Students	FTES	Students	FTES	Students	FTES	Students	FTES
02-03	71,927	10,125.0	22,844	2,848.3	604	66.7	14,029	1,698.5	97,782	14,738.5
01-02	77,719	10,838.1	34,974	4,292.9	663	77.3	36,353	4,384.1	123,108	19,592.4
00-01	58,188	7,225.4	26,954	3,597.8	3,050	330.1	34,919	4,200.8	99,002	15,354.1
99-00	41,841	5,234.0	19,497	2,434.5	223	22.7	24,564	2,936.4	70,094	10,627.6
98-99	39,315	4,477.0	12,966	1,649.7	243	20.9	21,011	2,592.8	62,406	8,740.4
97-98	32,469	3,381.4	9,823	1,226.4	262	26.8	17,380	2,215.1	51,062	6,849.7
96-97	16,238	1,527.8	7,013	825.2	198	16.0	14,009	1,660.3	32,809	4,029.3
95-96	14,600	1,389.8	4,078	431.0	187	14.4	7,828	830.3	24,287	2,665.5
94-95	15,089	1,508.9	4,996	579.0	241	19.8	6,627	715.4	24,264	2,823.1
93-94	13,507	1,287.9	4,602	571.3	285	23.6	6,798	747.0	22,577	2,629.8
92-93	8,032	814.9	5,106	590.7	149	9.4	6,720	717.2	17,617	2,132.2

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Student Demographics

In examining the loss of students that occurred in Spring 2003, it is important to examine changes in student demographics that might have occurred as a result of supply constriction. In doing this, we will examine population distributions before and after the supply constriction to see if demographic elements of the CCC populations changed as a result.

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Gender. Table 10 shows less than a 1% difference in the distribution of student gender in the total CCC student population.

Table 10: Distribution of Students by Gender, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Gender	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
Female	54.9%	55.7%	55.8%
Male	44.1%	43.2%	43.1%
Unknown	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Ethnicity. Table 11 shows less than 1% differences in the distribution of student ethnicity in the total CCC student population.

Table 11: Distribution of Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Ethnicity	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander	15.7%	16.0%	15.9%
Hispanic	26.8%	27.1%	27.0%
Black/African American	7.0%	7.2%	7.1%
Native American	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%
Other Non-White	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
White	40.5%	39.7%	39.9%
Unknown/Decline to State	7.1%	7.2%	7.3%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Age. Table 12 shows a significant decline in the distribution of students less than 17 years of age offset by an increase in students of age 20-24. All other age groups show less than 1% differences in the distribution of student age in the total CCC student population. The drop in students age 17 or less can be attributed to a drop in the number of special admit (K-12) students in Spring 2003.

Table 12: Distribution of Students by Age, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Age	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
0-17	5.7%	5.4%	4.1%
18-19	15.2%	17.2%	15.9%
20-24	25.4%	25.9%	27.1%
25-29	12.2%	12.0%	12.4%
30-34	9.3%	9.0%	9.1%
35-39	7.6%	7.1%	7.2%
40-49	12.0%	11.3%	11.7%
50+	12.2%	11.8%	12.3%
Unknown/Decline to State	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Educational Goal. Table 13 shows a significant increase in the distribution of students with a goal of "degree/certificate/transfer-seeking", as stated by students on their application for enrollment. This increase was offset by a decrease in the distribution of students with "all other" goals (discover/formulate career interests, acquire/update job skills, maintain licensure, intellectual development, improve basic skills, and complete high school GED.)

Table 13: Distribution of Students by Educational Goal, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Goal	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
Degree/Certificate/Transfer-Seeking	38.1%	41.0%	40.4%
Undecided	16.6%	16.6%	16.2%
Unknown	12.9%	11.8%	11.8%
All Other	32.4%	30.7%	31.5%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by First-Census Credit Load. Table 14 shows a slight decline in the distribution of students who were part-time and a slight increase in students who were full-time. Credit loads were measured as of first-census date.

Table 14: Distribution of Students by First Census Credit Load, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

First Census Credit Load	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
Part-Time (<12 Semester Units)	74.6%	72.6%	73.8%
Full-Time (=> 12 Semester Units)	25.4%	27.4%	26.2%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Units Earned. While this metric shows less than a 1% difference in the distribution, the percentage of students earning 12 or more units is showing an upward trend during this time, as seen below in Figure 15.

Table 15: Distribution of Students by Units Earned, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Units Earned	Spring 2002	Fall 2002	Spring 2003
0-11.9	90.0%	89.4%	89.3%
12 or more	10.0%	10.6%	10.7%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Total Student Populations: Distribution by Enrollment Status. Table 16 shows the distribution of student populations in the CCC system by enrollment status. There are some very significant deviations worth noting here.

Of greatest deviation is the decline in the distribution of special admit (K-12) students in the system.

There was a significant loss from Spring 2002 to Spring 2003 of first-time students and returning students (students who have enrolled previously, stopped out at some point, and returned to the system). Partially offsetting these losses is an increase in the number of continuing students.

This loss of first-time and returning students represents a true loss of access to a group of students who could not enter our system. Not only did the CCC system lose almost 40,000 of these new and returning students, the system did not keep up with the normal expected gains that were occurring for the fifteen prior primary terms, a headcount figure calculated to be approximately 50,000. It is estimated that the total loss of access in Spring, 2003 was approximately 90,000 students, excluding the losses in special admit (K-12) students.

Table 16: Student Headcount by Enrollment Status, Spring 2002-Spring 2003

Enrollment Status	Spring 2002	Spring 2003	Change: Spring 2002-Spring 2003	Pct.
First-Time	361,271	335,358	-25,913	-7.2%
Continuing	996,950	1,024,804	27,854	2.8%
Returning	223,007	209,452	-13,555	-6.1%
Special Admit	93,781	47,426	-46,355	-49.4%
Unknown	66,343	73,414	7,071	10.7%
Total	1,741,352	1,690,454	-50,898	-2.9%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Access Lost: First-Time and Returning Students. Table 17 shows the historical headcount of first-time and returning students. The largest drop in these groups in the past ten years occurred in Spring 2003, as compared to prior Spring terms.

Table 17: Total Headcount of First-Time and Returning Students for Spring Terms 1993-2003

Spring Term	Headcount	Headcount Loss-Spring to Spring	Percentage
1993	495,155		
1994	475,632	-19,523	-3.9%
1995	447,218	-28,414	-6.0%
1996	483,294	36,076	8.1%
1997	504,413	21,119	4.4%
1998	510,896	6,483	1.3%
1999	530,178	19,282	3.8%
2000	512,995	-17,183	-3.2%
2001	542,239	29,244	5.7%
2002	584,278	42,039	7.8%
2003	544,810	-39,468	-6.8%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

First-Time and Returning Student Populations: Distribution by Gender. Figure 18 shows less than a 1% difference in the distribution of student gender in the CCC first-time and returning student population.

Table 18: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Gender, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

Gender	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003
Female	51.2%	50.9%	51.8%	52.4%
Male	47.6%	47.9%	46.8%	46.3%
Unknown/Decline to State	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.4%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

First-Time, Returning, and Continuing Student Populations: Distribution by Ethnicity. Table 19 shows some changes in the ethnicity of first-time and returning student populations in Spring 2003 as compared to previous Spring terms; however, as shown in Table 20 (ethnicity distribution of continuing students), it seems as though these changes are mirroring the overall changes in the entire student population, and are not representing any trends that are unique to the first-time and returning student populations. In both cases, there is a continual decline of white students offset by increases in Hispanic students.

Table 19: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

Ethnicity	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003
Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander	13.8%	13.5%	14.4%	14.3%
Black/African American	7.6%	7.4%	7.6%	7.8%
Hispanic	24.5%	25.3%	26.3%	26.6%
Native American	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Other Non-White	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%
White	43.6%	42.2%	41.3%	40.4%
Unknown/Decline to State	7.4%	8.5%	7.4%	8.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Table 20: Distribution of Continuing Students by Ethnicity, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

Ethnicity	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003
Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander	16.8%	16.8%	17.0%	17.3%
Black/African American	7.1%	6.8%	6.8%	6.9%
Hispanic	25.5%	26.1%	27.0%	27.5%
Native American	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
Other Non-White	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
White	41.8%	40.7%	40.0%	39.3%
Unknown/Decline to State	6.0%	6.8%	6.3%	6.2%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

First-Time and Returning Student Populations: Distribution by Day-Evening Status. Table 21 shows a significant decrease in the proportion of students taking evening courses exclusively (course start time is after 4:30 PM weekdays or anytime on weekends.)

Table 21: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Day-Evening Status, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

Day-Evening Status	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003
Day	54.4%	53.9%	55.2%	57.3%
Evening	45.6%	46.1%	44.8%	42.7%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

First-Time and Returning Student Populations: Distribution by Age. Table 22 shows a significant decrease in the proportion of older (age 25 or greater) first-time and returning students; it is likely that this segment of the population suffered a disproportionate impact due to the supply constriction.

Table 22: Distribution of First-Time and Returning Students by Age, Spring 2000-Spring 2003

Age Group	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003
<25	35.4%	35.6%	36.2%	39.0%
>=25	64.6%	64.4%	63.8%	61.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services

Conclusions

There are a number of significant findings in this report that help to illuminate the effects of the supply constriction that occurred in the CCC system beginning in Fall 2002 and that occurred specifically in Spring, 2003. Some metrics suggest that the systems' rationing of resources were equal, and caused little to no effect on certain course offerings and student populations. These include no significant findings of distribution changes of:

- Credit/noncredit course offerings
- Total student population and first-time/returning student gender
- Total student population and first-time/returning student ethnicity

Other metrics show that supply constriction caused distribution changes in the following areas:

- Total student headcount: down
- Total course section offerings: down
- Non-transferable sections: reduced at a rate higher than transferable sections
- Vocational course offerings: reduced at a rate higher than non-vocational sections
- Special Admit Students in Physical Education courses: activity reduced by 61.3% from prior Spring
- Total student population by age: significant distribution reduction in students 17 years of age or less and an increase in the percentage of students age 20-24
- Student Goal: Greater percentage of students with "degree/certificate/transfer-seeking" as their stated goal
- Student Credit Load/units earned: Greater percentage of Spring-term students who were full-time, less who were part-time; greater percentage of students earning 12 or more units in Spring

The most significant findings came in the change in distribution of student enrollment status from Spring 2002 to Spring 2003, which showed:

- A significant drop in the number of first-time and returning students; this amounted to a real loss of ~40,000 students from the prior Spring term, and a loss of an estimated additional 50,000 students who would have normally accounted for growth
- A significant drop in the number of special admit (K-12) students
- An increase in the number of continuing students

Focusing specifically on the loss of first-time and returning students, some significant demographic patterns emerged:

- A decrease in the percentage of first-time/returning students who attend classes in the evening

- A significant decrease in the percentage of students who were older (age 25 or above)

Looking at the students lost and the types of courses lost (FTES), concern about vocational education programs and retraining programs for adults is warranted. Additionally, supply constriction has caused a disproportionate loss of access to older first-time and returning students, a phenomenon that implies that the opportunity for higher education in a public institution in California is less attainable as a students' entry point into the system is delayed.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐

This document is Federally-funded, *or* carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").